APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,324	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04786US	8852

7590 01/13/2006	**EXAMINER**
Siemens Corporation	DAVIS, ZACHARY A
Intellectual Property Department	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/817,324	ROYER ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Zachary A. Davis	2137		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 November 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A response was received on 01 November 2005. No claims have been

amended, added, or canceled. Claims 1-23 are currently pending in the present

application.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 01 November 2005 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cohen et al,

US Patent 6178511, in view of Levergood et al, US Patent 5708780. Claims 1 and 3-23

were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cohen in view of Levergood

and de la Huerga et al, US Patent 5903889.

Regarding Applicant's arguments as a whole, in response to applicant's

arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of

references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck &*

Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Specifically, in reference to independent Claims 1, 6, 14, 21, and 23, Applicant

argues that Levergood does not disclose "automatically communicating application

specific context information... in response to authentication of said user identification

information", nor does de la Huerga. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner believes that Levergood does disclose communicating the application specific context information "in response to authentication" (see column 6, lines 58-66, and column 7, lines 15-21, where after authentication of the user, a URL with an SID including user identification, i.e. context information, is automatically forwarded).

Applicant further argues that de la Huerga does not even contemplate a "session" and therefore cannot disclose a session identifier. However, the Examiner first notes that de la Huerga was not relied upon for the explicit disclosure of a session identifier, and that Levergood was instead relied upon for disclosure of this feature. De la Huerga was instead relied upon for the general teaching of placing the context information (e.g. patient identifier) in a separate data field from other information. Because the references are in a similar area of endeavor (noting that both Levergood and de la Huerga, both send context information in fields of URLs), it is reasonable to combine their teachings. The Examiner therefore believes that the combination of Levergood and de la Huerga would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to send context information and session information in separate fields of a URL.

Applicant additionally argues that session identification information is not application specific context information and therefore does not support acquisition from the second application of information associated with a current operational context of the first application (see page 15 of the present response). However, the Examiner notes that Applicant's specification defines context information to include a session identifier (page 5, lines 28-29 of the present specification). Further, the Examiner

believes that Levergood does disclose acquiring information associated with a current

operational context (where a page is forwarded based on the session identifier received;

see, for example, column 6, lines 22-24).

In response to applicant's argument that "incorporating the de la Huerga features

in Cohen with Levergood ... results in the system burden of requiring a user to initiate at

least a second command" (see page 15 of the present response), the Examiner first

notes that the result of such a combination is mere speculation on the part of Applicant.

Further, the Examiner reminds Applicant that the test for obviousness is not whether the

features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the

primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in

any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the

references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*,

642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re*

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to

combine Cohen and Levergood is to allow access to all controlled files within a specific

domain without requiring additional authorization beyond the initial authorization as

suggested by Levergood (column 3, lines 50-55) and cited in the previous actions. The

motivation to further incorporate de la Huerga was also cited in the previous action,

namely, to allow for economical and easy access to information, particularly medical

records, stored in various distributed databases (see de la Huerga, column 2, lines 40-

62).

Therefore, for the reasons of motivation cited above, the Examiner maintains that

it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the various teachings of

Cohen (notably the single sign-on through an authentication service), Levergood

(notably automatically communicating session.identification and user identification data

in a data field of a URL), and de la Huerga (notably communicating context information

and other data in separate fields).

Regarding dependent Claim 4, Applicant again argues that the references do not

teach or suggest dynamic compilation of a database including authentication service

identifier and user identifier data pairs. The Examiner notes that this argument was

addressed in the previous Action, which comments Applicant has not attempted to

rebut. Specifically, the Examiner first notes that the claim does not recite that the

database is compiled *dynamically*, merely that a database is compiled. That distinction

notwithstanding, the Examiner believes that the cited portions of Cohen do, in fact,

suggest that the database can be modified dynamically (see column 5, lines 5-6, where

passwords in the database are managed, i.e. they can be changed and are therefore

dynamic; see also column 5, lines 45-58 where the logon targets can be created,

updated, and deleted). Further, the Examiner believes that the cited portion of Cohen

does disclose both a user identifier (column 4, lines 64-67, where a username and

passwords are stored in the database) and an authentication service identifier (column

5, lines 1-2, where domain, host, and application names are stored; also column 5, lines

45-58 where logon targets are defined in the database). Similarly regarding dependent

Claim 7, the Examiner believes that Cohen does disclose an authentication service

identifier (see above).

Regarding dependent Claim 8, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37

CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a

patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims

patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Regarding dependent Claim 11, Applicant again argues that the references do

not teach or suggest communicating a parameter indicating success or failure. The

Examiner notes that this argument was addressed in the previous Action, which

comments Applicant has not attempted to rebut. Specifically, the Examiner notes that

the cited portion does indeed disclose a parameter indicating success or failure (the

return codes of column 10, lines 35-37, noting that the immediately preceding section

further describes a single sign-on where a username and password are presented to

logon to a domain); the Examiner additionally notes that it would be obvious to provide

such a parameter for any action where it is of use to know whether the action

succeeded.

Regarding independent Claim 2, again, in response to applicant's arguments

against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking

references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Specifically, Applicant argues that Levergood does not disclose encrypting an address portion and that the "domain" of Levergood is not an address. The Examiner does not dispute Applicant's assertion that Levergood distinguishes between the URL in which the encrypted identifier is included and the IP address of the user computer. However, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's characterization of the domain. The Examiner notes that Applicant again states that the domain is defined as a "collection of controlled files of common protection within one or more servers". The Examiner again asserts that if the domain includes a collection of files within a server, then the domain *must* include at least some identification and/or, as a logical form of identification, addresses for these files. Therefore, the Examiner believes that it is, at the very least, implicitly suggested that the domain can include an address portion of a URL. The Examiner notes that Levergood discloses that as part of the validation process, it is determined whether the destination page of the entered matches the domain encrypted in the SID in the URL (see column 5, line 66-column 6, line 16). The Examiner believes that this further suggests that the domain includes an address of a URL.

Further, in response to applicant's argument that Levergood has a different purpose than the present application (see page 25 of the present response), the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the

differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd.

Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Further, it is unclear to the Examiner why Applicant argues

against "amending the Levergood system to include the claimed arrangement" when the

teachings of the Levergood system are being used to modify the Cohen system, and not

vice versa.

Therefore, for the reasons detailed above, the Examiner maintains the rejections

set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The rejection of Claims 1 and 3-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is

withdrawn in light of the clarifications presented in the present response (pages 9-10 of

the present response).

4.   The Examiner further notes that the objection to the specification under 37 CFR

1.75(d)(1) is withdrawn for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et

al, US Patent 6178511, in view of Levergood et al, US Patent 5708780.

Cohen discloses a system used by a first application including an authentication

processor (Figure 2, Authentication Module 21) that receives user identification

information and initiates authentication of the user identification information using an

authentication service (column 6, lines 8-18) and a communication processor that

communicates an authentication service identifier and a corresponding user identifier to

a managing application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses the use of a

user identifier (column 4, line 64-column 5, line 2). However, Cohen does not explicitly

disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of a URL to a

second application in response a user command to initiate execution of the second

application, nor does Cohen explicitly disclose encrypting a URL address portion.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column

6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second application,

automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the

second application (see column 4, lines 1-18). Further, Levergood discloses that the

specific context information is a user identifier (column 5, lines 56-61) and that a URL

address portion is encrypted and incorporated into the URL (column 5, lines 61-65;

column 3, lines 34-37, noting that the SID includes a domain that is included under the

digital signature). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the

automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all

controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond

the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55).

7.   Claims 1 and 3-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Cohen in view of Levergood and de la Huerga et al, US Patent 5903889.

        In reference to Claim 1, Cohen discloses a system used by a first application

including an authentication processor (Figure 2, Authentication Module 21) that receives

user identification information and initiates authentication of the user identification

information using an authentication service (column 6, lines 8-18) and a communication

processor that communicates an authentication service identifier and a corresponding

user identifier to a managing application (column 6, lines 26-37). However, Cohen does

not explicitly disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of

a URL to a second application in response a user command to initiate execution of the

second application.

        Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column

6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second application,

automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the

second application (see column 4, lines 1-18) in response to authentication of user

identification information (see column 6, lines 58-66, and column 7, lines 15-21) where

the context information supports acquisition of information associated with a current

context (see column 6, lines 22-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of

Cohen by including the automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to

allow access to all controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional

authorization beyond the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55).

However, although Levergood discloses a session identifier (column 3, lines 12-16),

neither Levergood nor Cohen explicitly discloses that the application specific context

information is communicated separately from a session identifier.

De la Huerga discloses a system for linking various types of data records over

several systems, and further that the system includes URL addresses that include

application specific context information and chronological (e.g. session) identification

information transmitted in separate fields of the URL (see column 10, lines 43-59, where

the context information includes the patient identifier, and the URL also includes

date/time information; see also Figure 14A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the

system of Cohen and Levergood by including separate URL fields as taught by de la

Huerga, in order to allow for economical and easy access to information, particularly

medical records, stored in various distributed databases (see de la Huerga, column 2,

lines 40-62).

In reference to Claim 3, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the user identification information includes a password (see Cohen, column 4, line

64-column 5, line 2; see also Levergood column 6, lines 47-49) and the use of a session

identifier (see Levergood, column 3, lines 12-16, where SID is a session identifier).

Additionally, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga disclose that application specific

context information is a patient identifier (see de la Huerga, column 10, lines 49-52).

In reference to Claims 4 and 5, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further

disclose compiling a database accessible to other applications for mapping a user

identifier of one application to an already authenticated user identifier of another

application (see Cohen, column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6, and column 5, lines 16-22;

also noting column 5, lines 45-58, where the database can be updated dynamically).

In reference to Claim 6, Cohen discloses a system including an authentication

processor that receives and compiles into a database pairs of authentication service

identifiers and user identifiers (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and maps a user

identifier of a second application to an already authenticated user identifier of a first

application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses a communication

processor that sends the authenticated user identifier to the second application (column

6, lines 38-45). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose automatically

communicating context information in a data field of a URL to the second application in

response a user command to initiate execution of the second application.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column

6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second application,

automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the

second application (see column 4, lines 1-18) where the context information supports

acquisition of information associated with a current context (see column 6, lines 22-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the automatic

communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all controlled files

within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond the initial

authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55). However, although Levergood

discloses a session identifier (column 3, lines 12-16), neither Levergood nor Cohen

explicitly discloses that the application specific context information is communicated

separately from a session identifier.

De la Huerga discloses a system for linking various types of data records over

several systems, and further that the system includes URL addresses that include

application specific context information and session identification information

transmitted in separate fields of the URL (see column 10, lines 43-59, where the context

information includes the patient identifier, and the URL also includes date/time/report

designation information indicative of a particular session; see also Figure 14A).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system of Cohen and Levergood by including

separate URL fields as taught by de la Huerga, in order to allow for economical and

easy access to information, particularly medical records, stored in various distributed

databases (see de la Huerga, column 2, lines 40-62).

In reference to Claim 7, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

identifying an authentication service that provides an authenticated user identifier (see

Cohen, column 4, lines 48-50).

In reference to Claim 8, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

matching the authentication service identifier of the second application with the

authentication service identifier of the first application (see Cohen, column 6, lines 26-

37).

In reference to Claim 9, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose the

use of a session identifier (see Levergood, column 3, lines 12-16, where SID is a

session identifier) and that a URL address portion is encrypted and incorporated into the

URL (see Levergood, column 5, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 34-37, noting that the SID

includes a domain that is included under the digital signature). Cohen, Levergood, and

de la Huerga additionally disclose that a key allowing for decryption is accessible to

multiple applications (see Levergood, column 5, lines 61-65, where the key is shared by

the authentication and content servers).

In reference to Claim 10, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the authenticated user identifier of the first application is used by the second

application (see Cohen, column 6, lines 38-45), thus eliminating the need for the second

application to authenticate the user (Cohen, column 2, lines 28-31).

In reference to Claim 11, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

sending a parameter identifying success or failure of the mapping (see Cohen, column

10, lines 35-37, where the return codes indicate success or failure of an operation).

In reference to Claim 12, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the authentication processor receives an authentication service identifier and user

identifier from the first application (see Cohen, column 6, lines 13-29).

In reference to Claim 13, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose that the authentication service identifier employs a predetermined data format (see Cohen, column 5, lines 30-44, and column 5, line 63-column 6, line 7).

In reference to Claim 14, Cohen discloses a system including an authentication processor that receives an authentication service identifier and a user identifier from a parent application (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and maps a user identifier of a child application to an already authenticated user identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses a communication processor that communicates the authenticated user identifier to the child application (column 6, lines 38-45). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of a URL to the child application in response a user command to initiate execution of the child application.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column 6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second (child) application, automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the second application (see column 4, lines 1-18) in response to authentication of a user identifier (see column 6, lines 58-66, and column 7, lines 15-21) where the context information supports acquisition of information associated with a current context (see column 6, lines 22-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all

controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond

the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55). However, although

Levergood discloses a session identifier (column 3, lines 12-16), neither Levergood nor

Cohen explicitly discloses that the application specific context information is

communicated separately from a session identifier.

De la Huerga discloses a system for linking various types of data records over

several systems, and further that the system includes URL addresses that include

application specific context information and session identification information

transmitted in separate fields of the URL (see column 10, lines 43-59, where the context

information includes the patient identifier, and the URL also includes date/time/report

designation information indicative of a particular session; see also Figure 14A).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system of Cohen and Levergood by including

separate URL fields as taught by de la Huerga, in order to allow for economical and

easy access to information, particularly medical records, stored in various distributed

databases (see de la Huerga, column 2, lines 40-62).

In reference to Claim 15, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the parent application begins a session and the child application uses the

authentication system to join the session (see Cohen, column 6, lines 38-45; see also

Levergood, noting column 3, lines 12-16, where a session is identified by SID).

In reference to Claim 16, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the authentication processor compiles a database using pairs of authentication

service identifiers and corresponding user identifiers (see Cohen, column 4, line 61-

column 5, line 6) and uses the database in mapping the user identifier of the child

application to the already authenticated user identifier of the parent application (Cohen,

column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 17, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

matching the authentication service identifier of the child application with the

authentication service identifier of the parent application (see Cohen, column 6, lines

26-37).

In reference to Claim 18, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

identifying an authentication service that provides an authenticated user identifier (see

Cohen, column 4, lines 48-50).

In reference to Claim 19, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the authenticated user identifier of the parent application is used by the child

application (see Cohen, column 6, lines 38-45), thus eliminating the need for the child

application to authenticate the user (Cohen, column 2, lines 28-31). Additionally,

Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga disclose that application specific context

information is a patient identifier (see de la Huerga, column 10, lines 49-52).

In reference to Claim 20, Cohen, Levergood, and de la Huerga further disclose

that the child application enables access in response to receiving the authenticated user

identifier without the user re-entering the user identification information (see Cohen,

column 2, lines 28-31, and column 6, lines 38-45).

Claims 21 and 22 are method claims that correspond substantially to the systems

of claims 14 and 16 respectively, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 23 is a method claim that corresponds substantially to the system of claim

1, and is accordingly rejected by a similar rationale.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Zachary A. Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate

Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

zad

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137